



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark. Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
08/987,005	12/08/1997	MATHEW G. HOWELL	MICL:038	5721	
75	90 03/10/2005		EXAMINER		
COE F. MILE	S		TUGBANG, A	NTHONY D	
TROP, PRUNE 8554 KATY FR	,		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
STE. 100	add W M I		3729		
HOUSTON, TX 77024			DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• •						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	1/1		
		08/987,005	HOWELL, MATHEW	G.		
Office Acti	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		A. Dexter Tugbang	3729			
The MAILING DA	ATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	ss		
THE MAILING DATE C - Extensions of time may be averafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift the period for reply specified. If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set.	OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ne mailing date of this communication. If above is less than thirty (30) days, a replified above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statute ce later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE g date of this communication, even if timely filed	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this committee (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.		
Status						
1) Responsive to co	ommunication(s) filed on 22 N	ovember 2004.				
2a) ☐ This action is FIN	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.				
, —		nce except for formal matters, pro Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4		erits is		
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) i 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>22-34</u> is 7) ☐ Claim(s) i	s/are rejected.	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification	is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) fil	0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not	request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
		tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob carniner. Note the attached Office	•	• •		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119					
12) Acknowledgment a) All b) Som 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of to	is made of a claim for foreign e * c) None of: opies of the priority document opies of the priority document the certified copies of the prior from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive	ion No ed in this National Sta	ge		
Attachment(s)	(77.0.00)					
Notice of References Cited Notice of Draftsperson's Page 1	(PTO-892) atent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
· — ·	ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application (PTO-15	2)		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/22/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 22, it is unclear from the disclosure what is meant by the phrase of "the tray including an open groove...from the groove" (lines 2-5), which is misleading, confusing and renders the claims as being vague and indefinite. The specification does not use the term of an "open groove" explicitly, so it is unclear what edges define the "open groove". For instance, in reviewing the applicant(s) Figure 2, the so called "open groove" is considered to be defined by at least edges 12, 14, 18 and 20 of the tray 11. Since the claim requires that there be a "notch in the first edge" (line 7) and a "notch in the second edge" (lines 7-8), one can only deduce that the

Application/Control Number: 08/987,005

Art Unit: 3729

"first and second longitudinal edges" (lines 2-3) are edges 19 and 21, respectively. So in looking at Figure 2, how is edge 19 "substantially parallel" (line 3) to edge 21?

Page 3

Furthermore, how is edge 19 located at a first distance *from* the groove if edge 19 forms one outer boundary of the groove? So it appears (from Fig. 2) that the first longitudinal edge 19 is not located at any distance *from* the groove. Even further confusion is raised by the recitation of "the second longitudinal edge being located a second distance greater than the first distance from the groove", because the edge 21 also forms another outer boundary of the groove, which again, is not at any distance from the groove. Therefore, the second distance cannot be greater than the first distance, *from* the groove.

In Claim 23, the recitation of "wherein the first...other" (lines 1-2) contradicts the previous recitation of "first and second...other" (lines 2-3 of Claim 22). How is it possible to have the first and second longitudinal edges be both substantially parallel and orthogonal, at the same time?

In Claim 29, the same problems occur in Claim 29 as with Claim 22 above.

In Claim 30, the same problems occur in Claim 30 as with Claim 23 above.

4. NOTE: No art rejections have been applied to the claims since there are a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of claims.

Furthermore, the examiner will not speculate as the interpretation of the limitations above in question. Therefore, it would not be proper to reject such claims on the basis of prior art. See MPEP 2173.06.

Application/Control Number: 08/987,005 Page 4

Art Unit: 3729

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Dexter Tugbang whose telephone number is 571-272-4570. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. Dexter Tugbang

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3729

March 4, 2005